

**COMMENT LETTER 60 - ROBB LEVINSKY (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996), RECEIVED
SEPTEMBER 27, 1996**

Response to Comment 60-1

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that the Draft EIR/EIS is flawed since it does not offer a thoughtful unbiased analysis of the real cost and viability of each alternative and seeks to accommodate maximum growth in Sonoma County regardless of the cost to present residents.

The Project alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS do not accommodate maximum growth, but do achieve the Project objective to “accommodate the growth as indicated in the currently adopted General Plans of each of the Subregional entities” (refer to page 1-3). Project costs and resulting economic impacts are addressed on pages 4.18-22 through 4.18-53 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The environmental impacts of each alternative are evaluated throughout the document.

Response to Comment 60-2

Comment Summary: The comment states that the EIR ignores the damage to tourism from River discharge.

Refer to Master Response 7, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding impacts to the tourist economy.

Response to Comment 60-3

Comment Summary: The comment states that Marin County officials have concern regarding Russian River discharge.

Refer to Responses to Letter 18 from the North Marin Water District and Letter 19 from the Marin Municipal Water District, which address concerns regarding Russian River discharge.

Response to Comment 60-4

Comment Summary: The comment urges consideration of small storage facilities and a phased Project.

Refer to Master Response 14 regarding phasing and small storage facilities. Master Response 14 is located in Section 6.2 of this document

Response to Comment 60-5

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that the Draft EIR/EIS only seeks to promote the most expeditious solution to maximize growth in Sonoma County and notes willingness, as a taxpayer, to pay more to make proper use of the reclaimed water.

The Draft EIR/EIS acknowledges that, although construction costs are less for river discharge, there are no real economic benefits to discharge, and thus there is a net economic cost to the region, while agricultural irrigation can have a significant economic benefit. See Table 4.18-18 on page 4.18-49. It will be the job of decision makers to weigh the environmental and socioeconomic costs of each alternative in selecting a Project.